TEACHING READING COMPREHENSION BY USING K.W.L GRAPHIC ORGANIZER TECHNIQUE TO THE EIGHTH GRADE STUDENTS OF JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL OF BINA JAYA PALEMBANG

Nita Ria[1)], Ridha Ilma[2)]
[1) 2)] English Study Program, Tridinanti University Palembang
[1)] rnita656@gmail.com
[2)] ridhailma@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aimed to find out whether or not there was any significant difference in reading comprehension between the eighth grade students of Bina Jaya Junior High School Palembang who were taught by using K.W.L graphic organizer technique and those who were not. Seventy-two eighth graders were the sample of the study.The writers did an experimental method by using quasi-experimental design to the two groups of students. The VIII.3 class became the experimental group and the VIII.2 class was the control group. A reading comprehension test was an instrument to collect the data. The result found that the significant level was 0.000 < 0.05, so that (Ha) was accepted and (Ho) was rejected. So, there was a significant difference on students' reading comprehension between the eighth grade students of Bina Jaya Junior High School Palembang who were taught by using KWL Graphic Organizer and those who were not.

Keywords: *reading comprehension, KWL graphic organizer*

p–ISSN 2549–9009
e–ISSN 2579–7378

Introduction

Reading is an important language skill that is now in more demand than in any time in the history (Swalm and King, 2000).Reading has many benefits for the readers. It enhances their lives because reading gives them a greater understanding on everything. It is believed that reading is a way to relax and enrich the reader's mind since reading activities can give more lesson, sense of, values, and ideas.

In reading comprehension, the students may face some problems for example in speed reading, their eyes keep wandering back and forth over the page; they may show low motivation, lack of concentration, and limited vocabulary as they are reading for comprehension (Price, 2009). Besides better materials, the effective technique can also make the students study harder. The K.W.L graphic organizer technique is a method to be used to improve students reading comprehension achievement.

Based on the investigation done by the writers at Bina Jaya Junior High School Palembang, they found that the students felt bored with the technique used by teachers in teaching reading. The teachers just asked the students to read many pages of reading passages and asked them to answer the questions every meeting. Besides, the teachers used reading passages which only available in the textbook without giving the hottest or the most interesting topic to the students. In fact, the students were not enthusiast in joining reading class because of uninteresting method or topic of reading used by the teachers.

As facilitators, teachers have to be able to facilitate learner to learn. One of them is facilitating the learner with appropriate teaching learning strategy so that they can easily learn. Considering that condition, the researchers propose to change the condition by conducting a research concerns on implementing K-W-L Strategy to solve the problems of students' reading in that school.

Know-Want-Learn (KWL) is an instructional reading technique that is used to activate students' background knowledge, assist students in setting purposes for reading, and help students to monitor reading comprehension by using graphic organizer (Peregoy & Boyle, 2001, p. 70). KWL

strategy theoretically can improve students' reading comprehension. It serves as a model of active thinking during reading. The teacher will help the students to activate their prior knowledge in KWL strategy. It is intended to be an exercise for study group or class although it can be adapted to working alone. KWL Strategy benefits in many ways. According to Ogle (1986), this strategy enabled to be used for brainstorming at the beginning of the lesson or unit to find out what students already know. KWL Strategy can help students to monitor their comprehension. Finally KWL is intended to be an exercise, for a study group or class, which can guide students in reading and understanding a text. It can be adapted by students to work alone, but discussions definitely help. KWL Strategy provides an opportunity for the students to expand their ideas beyond the text. Therefore, the writer was interested to investigate whether or not there was any significant difference in reading comprehension between the eighth grade students of Bina Jaya Junior High School Palembang who were taught by using K.W.L graphic organizer technique and those who were not.

The Concept of Reading

Gates (1985, p. 165) in referring to the "nature of the reading process" stated: Reading is essentially a thoughtful process. However to say that reading is "a thought getting" process was to give too restricted description. It will be develop as a complex organization of patterns of higher mental processes. It can and will embrace all types of thinking, evaluating, judging, imagining, reasoning and problem solving. In whole hearted reading activity the child does more than understand and contemplate his emotion are stirred; his attitude and purposes are modified; indeed; his innermost being was involved.

The Concept of Reading Comprehension

Zwiers (2004, p. 99) said that reading comprehension is a three-stage process. Each stage includes questioning, and each of questioning are made by the readers itself. **First,** the readers must ask good questions before they read as preparing to find and store the information. **Second**, during reading the readers must ask questions which are about the main ideas and the purposes of the content reading text itself. **Third**, after reading, the readers must ask questions more to further organize what they are learning.

The Purposes of Reading

Hedge (2001, p. 206) described seven purposes in reading which are develop into a framework for text selection with intermediate high-school or adults students, they are as follows:

1. Getting information
   If we want to find out a specific information for our necessary needs, for example, to know the flight schedule, we can get it by reading brochures, or if we want to find out another transportation's schedule, we can find it by reading train timetable and bus schedules.

2. Finding and curiosity about a topic
   If we want to find out important information about in interesting topic, reading some interesting articles in magazine, advertisement,and specialist brochures can get it.

3. Following instructions
   If we are in another country that we do not know either about the names of its road, especially some important places there, we can find out them by reading maps. It can give us some information that we need by following the instructions in it. Another reading's form that involves the instructions of it was route planners and recipes.

4. Pleasuring and enjoyment
   If we want to find out something in written language which can make us enjoyable in our break time, we can get it by reading poems, short stories, plays, and cartoons.

5. Keeping in touch
   As a sociable person, we must have a good relation to another person. For

example, a friend in another place, that was very far from our place. For keeping a good relation to him or her, we have to send him or her letter and vice versa. We can get some information about our friend by reading letter or messages from our friend.

6. Knowing what was happening in the world.
   To improve our knowledge or getting new information from all over the world, we can get it by reading news articles, news in brief and news reviews. Therefore, we will never be in regression.

7. Finding out when and where
   As a guide for a tour, we have to prepare our schedule, which include of the time and some places, which will be invited by us. We can get some information of its by reading tour guides. Beside of that, another text, which includes the time and the place, are announcements and programs.

The Concept of Recount and Narrative Text

Seaton (2007) claimed: Recount text was a reconstruction of something that happened in the past. It was the unfolding sequence of events over time and the purpose is to tell what happened. Recounts began with telling the reader who was involved, what happened, where this event took place and when it happened. The sequence of event was then described in some sort of order, for instance a time order.

Sudarwati and Grace (2007, p. 62) stated that narrative text is a text which has purpose to amuse and entertain the readers with actual or imaginary expression in different ways.

The concept of K.W.L Grapic Organizer Technique

NCREL (2006) stated that teachers activate students' prior knowledge by asking them what they already Know; then students(collaborating as a classroom unit or within small group) set goals specifying what they Want to learn; and after reading students discuss what they have Learned.

The Steps of K.W.L Grapic Organizer

The categories the steps of K.W.L on http:// www. Justrednow.com/ strategies/kwl.htm as follows:

1. K (Know):
   Students list everything they think they know about the topic of study.Ask the students to draw a K.W.L framework chart on the chalkboard. Remind students of the K.W.L process. Students will write the things they already know and the things they wish to know before reading. After reading, the students will complete the chart with things they have learned.then, have students as an entire class or in small groups outline their prior knowledge of the topic. Write, or have students write, each idea on the K.W.L chart. Next, ask students to raise questions they would like answered as they learn about the topic.

2. W (Want to know) :
   Students tell what they want to know about the topic. Have students read the selection and take notes on the things they learn.Emphasize new information that relates to the " What I want to know" questions.

3. L (Learned) :
   After students have finished reading or studying a topic, they list what they have learned. They can also check the W column to see which questions were answered and which were left unanswered. Then they should revisit the K column to see if they had any misconceptions.

Method of Research

Quasi-experimental method with pretest-posttest was used in this study. The population of the study was the eighth grade students of SMP Bina Jaya Palembang in the academic year

2016/2017.The total number of the population was 142 students. The writers chose cluster random sampling in this research, in order to determine the sample. VIII. 3 became the experimental group and VIII.2 became the control group. Reading comprehension test was. used to collect the data. The writers also used paired sample t-test to compare the average of two variables in one group. For analyzing the data, the writers used independent sample t-test.

Results and Discussion

In this section, the writers highlighted the result of the pretest and posttest from experimental group and control group that was given to the eighth grade students of Junior High School of Bina Jaya Palembang.The results of pretest and posttest in the experimental group were drawn in table 1 below:

Table1. The Score Distribution in Experimental Group

Score	Category	Pre-test		Post-test	
		Frequency	**Percentage**	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
86-100	Very Good	-	0.0%	9	25%
71-85	Good	-	0.0%	21	58.3%
56-70	Enough	3	8.3%	6	16.7%
41-55	Low	5	13.9%	-	0.0%
0-40	Failed	28	77.8%	-	0.0%
	Total	36	100%	36	100%

From the above table, the results of pretest for experimental group were as follow: 77.8% (reached by 28 students) got "Failed", 13.9% (reached by 5 students) got "Low", and 8.3% (reached by 3 students) got "Enough". After that, the results of posttest were 16.7% (reached by 6 students) got "Enough", 58.3% (reached by 21 students) got "Good", and 9 students got "Very good" with the percentage 25%. Then, the results of pretest and posttest in the experimental group were drawn in table 2 below:

Table 2. The Score Distribution in Control Group

Score	Category	Pre-test		Post-test	
		Frequency	**Percentage**	**Frequency**	**Percentage**
86-100	Very Good	-	0.0%	-	0.0%
71-85	Good	-	0.0%	1	2.8%
56-70	Enough	-	0.0%	20	55.5%
41-55	Low	2	5.6%	13	36.1%
0-40	Failed	34	94.4%	2	5.6%
	Total	36	100%	36	100%

From the above table, the results of pretest for control group were: 34 students got "Failed" with the percentage 94.4% and 2 students got "Low" with the percentage 5.6%, there was no one of the students were categorized in "Good" and "Very good". Then, the results of posttest for control group showed 2 students got "Failed" with the percentage 5.6%, 36.1% (reached by 13 students) got "Low", 55.5% (reached by 20 students) got "Enough" and only 1 student got "Good" score with the percentage 2.8%. The descriptive statistics from students in the experimental group was drawn in table 3 below.

Table 3. Desctiptive Statistics from Students in the Experimental Group

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
PreExp	36	40	68	53.03	7.527	56.656
PostExp	36	38	68	50.44	6.996	48.940
Valid N (listwise)	36					

From the above table, it was found that the lowest score obtained in the pretest was 40 while the highest score was 68, the mean score was 53.03, and the standard deviation of the scores in the experimental group was 7.527. Meanwhile, the students' posttest scores in the experimental group showed that the lowest score obtained was 38 while the highest score was 68, the mean score was 50.44, and the standard deviation of the scores in the experimental group was 6.996. The descriptive statistics from students in the experimental group was drawn in table 4 below.

Table 3. Desctiptive Statistics from Students in the Control Group

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
PreCont	36	38	68	50.44	6.996	48.940
PostCont	36	55	81	68.11	6.923	47.930
Valid N (listwise)	36					

From the above table, it was found that the lowest score obtained in the pretest was 40 while the highest score was 68, the mean score was 53.03, and the standard deviation of the scores in the experimental group was 7.527. Meanwhile, the students' posttest scores in the experimental group showed that the lowest score obtained was 38 while the highest score was 68, the mean score was 50.44, and the standard deviation of the scores in the experimental group was 6.996. The descriptive statistics from students in the experimental group was drawn in table 5 below.

Table 5. Descriptive Statistics from Students in the Control Group

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Variance
PreCont	36	38	68	50.44	6.996	48.940
PostCont	36	55	81	68.11	6.923	47.930
Valid N (listwise)	36					

From the above table, it was found that the lowest score obtained in the pretest was 38 while the highest score was 68, the mean score of the pretest was 68, and the standard deviation of the pretest scores in the control was 6.996. Meanwhile, the statistical calculation in the posttest scores from the control group showed that the lowest score was 55 while the highest score was 81, the mean score of the posttest was 68.11, and standard deviation of the posttest scores in the control group was 6.923.

The Result of Paired Sample T-test

The results of paired sample t-test could be seen from the table 6 and 7 below.

Table 6. Paired Sample T-test for Experimental Group

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 PreExp – PostExp	-29.444	6.826	1.138	-31.754	-27.135	-25.881	35	.000

The result of the paired samplet-test showed the value of t-obtained was 25.881 at the significant level p<0.05 for two tailed test and degree of freedom was 35, t-table was 1.658. Since the value of t-obtained was higher than t-table , so that the null hypothesis (Ho) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted.

Table 7. Paired Sample for Control Group

	Paired Differences					t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 PreCont – PostCont	-17.667	9.713	1.619	-20.953	-14.380	-10.913	35	.000

The result of the paired samplet-test showed the value of t-obtained was 10.913 at the significant level p<0.05 for two tailed test and degree of freedom was 35, t-table was 1.658. Since the value of t-obtained was higher than t-table , so that the null hypothesis (Ho) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted.

The Data Analysis of The Independent Sample T-test

Based on the data collected from both experimental and control group, the writer used Independent sample t-test in SPSS 20 program to compare the result of post-test between experimental group and control group. The result of this analysis was shown in the table 8 below.

Table 8. The Result of Independent Sample T-test

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference Lower	Upper
Pos test Equal variances assumed	2.144	.148	9.813	70	.000	14.361	1.463	11.442	17.280
Equal variances not assumed			9.813	66.088	.000	14.361	1.463	11.439	17.283

Based on the result of the above table, the value of significant (2-tailed) was 0.00 < 0.05 at the level significant 0.05. While, the value of t-obtained was 9.813 higher than 1.690924 based on t-table with degree of freedom 34 So that the null hypothesis (Ho) was rejected and the alternative hypothesis (Ha) was accepted.

Discussion

Based on the results of analysis, the calculation indicated that result of pretest in experimental group was twenty-eight students got failed with the range score 0-40, five students got low score with the range score 41-55, and the rest three students got enough with the range 56-70, it might be caused by some factors such as the students had low motivation to start reading, they were confused with the instructions and it was difficult for them to get the idea of reading text. The posttest result in experimental group showed that six students got enough with the range score 56-70, twenty-one students got good with the range score 71-85, and nine students got very good with the range score 86-100. It happened because the students had treated by the new method. There were no students who were categorized low and failed. The result showed the significant difference in experimental group from pretest to posttest. Since after the treatment, the students got more understanding in comprehending the reading text. They were more motivated to read more reading text as they taught that the teaching method was interesting. On the other hand, the result of pretest in control group showed that thirty-four students got failed with the range score 0-40, and two students got low score with the range score 41-55. The students in this group had no enough prior knowledge about the reading text, they did not have any knowledge about narrative and recount text, they were not interested in reading, and they got confused with the unclear instructions. The posttest also showed little improvement. There were two students who got failed in the range score 0-40, then there were thirteen students who got low score in the range score 41-55, then there were twenty students who were categorized enough in the range score 56-70, and only one student who were categorized in good in the range score 71-85. It might because of the same factors with the same instructions but they were not given the treatment. The results showed that there was no significant difference in control group from pretest to posttest. Moreover, the writer found that the result based on the output values of the paired sample t-test, Sig. (2-tailed) 0.000<0.05 for experimental group, it meant that there was a significant difference after the treatment. Further, from the independent sample t-test, the writer also found the result based on the output values obtained Sig. (2-tailed) 0.000<0.05, it meant that there was a significant difference between post-test results of experimental group and control group in which the posttest results of experimental group showed the better score than the posttest results of control group. So that based on the Independent Sample T-test and Paired Sample T-test analysis, it could be concluded that Ho was rejected and Ha was accepted, it meant that there was a significant difference in reading comprehension between students who were taught by using KWL Graphic Organizer (experimental group) and those (control group) who were not.

Next, during the study, the writer found some differences before and after the treatment. Students did not feel enthusiast to read even though the writer tried to motivate them. They did not enable to comprehend the reading text well. In addition, the students got confused because of some unclear instructions. After receiving the treatment by using KWL Graphic Organizer, they finally could comprehend the reading text well. They could find the main idea quickly and they could guess the purpose of reading text itself. Therefore, KWL Graphic Organizer took the students' interests and made them easier to start reading. In short, it was proven that the students' reading comprehension by using KWL Graphic Organizer was significantly improved. Besides, the previous related study that was done by Riswanto et al (2014) showed the same result that KWL Graphic Organizer

has improved the students' reading comprehension.

Conclusions.

Indeed, based on the above explanation, that there was a significant difference in improving students' reading comprehension by using KWL graphic organizer to the eighth grade students of Bina Jaya Junior High School Palembang. It can be proven from the students' score after posttest given. The students' writing score between pretest and posttest in experimental group were significantly different and the students' posttest score between experimental group and control group was also different. It means that the alternative hypotheses (Ha) was accepted and the null hypotheses (Ho) was rejected.

REFERENCES

Gates, A. (1985). *Reading in the elementary school*. Paper presented at the 48th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education.

Hedge, T. (2001). *Teaching and learning in the language classroom*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

North Central Regional Educational Laboratory (NCREL). (2006). *K.W.L*. Retrieved from http://www.ncrel.org/sdrs/areas/issues/students/learning/lr2kwl.htm. Accessed on February 12, 2017.

Ogle, D.M. (1986). KWL: A teaching model that develops active reading of expository text. *Reading Teacher, 39* (1), 564-570. Retrieved from http://www.indiana.edu/~l517 /KWL.htm . acc Accessed on February 12, 2017.

Peregoy, S. & Boyle, O. (2001). *Reading, writing & learning in ESL*. New York, USA: Addision Wesley Longman

Price, S. (2009). *Overcoming reading problems.* monas University. Retrieved from http : // www. Monash. Edu. Au / IIs/IIonline reading / reading-problems/ I.xml. Accessed on July 8th, 2016.

Seaton. (2007). *Recount text*. Retrieved from www.trigonalmedia.com. Accessed on January 18, 2017.

Sudarwati, Th. M & Grace, Eudia. (2008) *.Look ahead an English course for Senior High School students year X*. Jakarta, ID: Erlangga

Swalm & King. (2000). Why teacher should use timed in Reading ESL Classes. *TESL Journal, 19* (6). 1-7.

Zwiers, J. (2004). *Building reading comprehension habits in grades 6-12 A toolkit of classroom activities*. California, USA: International Reading Association.